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Foreword

By Nicky McIntyre, Executive Director, Mama Cash and Gerry Salole, Chief Executive Officer, European Foundation Centre

For the past decade, the value of investing in the rights and well-being of women and girls has been making headlines. The centrality of gender equality to the Millennium Development Goals, recent commitments by various governments and foundations to fund women and girls, and the creation of UN Women in 2010 reinforce some of the encouraging, concrete results that have emerged from the conversation about the importance of investing in women and girls.

How are European foundations engaging in this conversation? To what extent are European foundations providing funding to women and girls? In which areas? What approaches are they taking? Effective philanthropy depends on informed decision-making. Yet to date, there has been very little data to bring to bear on these questions. In this spirit, Mama Cash, the world’s oldest international women’s fund based in the Netherlands, commissioned this research study to understand the nature of European foundation support for women and girls and bridge the critical data gap in this area.

Our goals for this report are both collegial and catalytic. We hope that conversations and collaborations inspired by the research findings will contribute to mobilising leadership as well as realising increased giving in support of the rights, well-being, and empowerment of women and girls.

WHY DID WE FOCUS THIS RESEARCH ON FUNDING FOR WOMEN AND GIRLS?

Investment in the human rights of women and girls is not only just and right, it is, we believe, essential to achieving stable democracies based on fairness and dignity. Gender equality has become a cornerstone of the constitutional and legal frameworks of modern democratic states and is a key principle of international human rights law.

Investment in women and girls has also been widely shown to further economic development and well-being globally: How well countries support and empower women and girls in the economic, political, educational, and health realms correlates strongly with indicators of national health, including international competitiveness, GDP per capita, and human development outcomes. As The Economist has stated: ‘Forget China, India and the Internet: economic growth is driven by women’.

Two premises are becoming more widely understood and accepted: that investing in women and girls is inherently valuable and desirable in its own right and investing in women and girls palpably elevates the well-being of all.

Despite this awareness, there is still a long road ahead. We must ask how these powerful messages are translating into tangible resources for women’s and girls’ empowerment and human rights. While a number of European governments and foundations have stepped up to provide substantial funding and policy advocacy for women and girls, there is still a considerable need for funding in this area. The Association for Women’s Rights in Development’s ‘Where is the Money for Women’s Rights’ initiative continues to demonstrate that the majority of women’s and girls’ rights organisations are critically under-resourced and operate with annual budgets of under 50,000 USD.

This research report suggests that while foundations in Europe are providing funding that supports the rights and well-being of women and girls, they could play a more significant role. Of the European foundations surveyed for this study, 58 percent allocated less than 10 percent of their grant monies to programmes benefiting women and girls. Of those foundations that provided grants-level data for the study, the median percentage of total foundation grant monies allocated for women and girls was only 4.8 percent.
SEIZING OPPORTUNITY FOR WOMEN AND GIRLS

Long-term policy trends among global entities and governments have resulted in the erosion of hard-won labour and environmental standards and the privatisation of essential services benefitting women and girls. Nevertheless, women and girls around the world continue to fight for their rights, their safety and their lives. They are doing this in the face of difficult conditions such as rising fundamentalisms, violence against them as human rights defenders, in conflict zones, at work, and at home, and struggles over land use and sovereignty.

In the shorter term, the global economic crisis and recession has impacted women and girls disproportionately. The impact of the recession on the giving of governments, and even more, on private foundations, is still being played out. Under these pressures, the gains of the past decade are at stake. One analyst recently argued that there is a real chance that human rights—including women’s rights—are ‘dropping off the donor agenda.’ Finding funding to sustain the work of women’s and girls’ rights and empowerment organising continues to be an ongoing challenge.

Despite these challenges, there are opportunities to expand and deepen foundation engagement in this area.

While the foundations surveyed currently devote a relatively small percentage of their giving to women and girls, a full 90 percent of foundations, regardless of their present level of commitment, their size or location, expressed interest in at least a few issues related to women and girls, with a particular interest in the areas of violence, poverty, and access to education. Further, the report illustrates how foundations are actively exploring and experimenting to find the right approaches to giving more funding support to women and girls.

This gap between interest and investment tells us that there is genuine potential and motivation for European foundations to step up and provide more funding for women and girls.

THE WAY FORWARD

Foundations in this study represent the diversity of European foundations more generally. They have differences in missions and approaches, as well as in the barriers they face to engaging more deeply in funding women and girls.

Yet despite differences in missions and approaches, a broad range of European foundations are looking for ways to engage more effectively in giving directed at women and girls. This interest exists whether a particular foundation is focused on securing women’s human rights or on social service approaches.

The publication of this report offers new information and a fresh perspective to the philanthropic sector in Europe. While this report purposefully does not seek to deliver solutions as how best to support and fund women and girls, initial suggestions are offered in the conclusion of the report. We hope these ideas will inspire discussion and offer entry points for further dialogue about strategies and approaches that will resonate across the entire spectrum of European foundations. Ultimately, we want to stimulate more giving so that women and girls, and particularly women’s rights organisations, can have the power and resources they need to participate fully and equally in creating a peaceful, just, and sustainable world.

ENDNOTES

1. UN Women, created in 2010, is the United Nations (UN) organisation dedicated to gender equality and the empowerment of women. This newly consolidated entity centralises four UN women’s agencies into one and will have oversight over all the UN’s compliance with its gender commitments. It is expected to have an annual budget of 500 million USD.

2. Mama Cash seeks to support the human rights of women and girls around the world. However, in designing our research, we took a broader approach and focused on funding for women and girls whether or not it is undertaken with a rights-based approach. This was both a methodological and strategic choice and was supported by our European colleagues during the planning phase. Designating a broader scope for the research provides more entry points for foundations with a variety of interests.


Mama Cash, the world’s oldest international women’s fund, commissioned this study to broaden knowledge about the philanthropic sector in Europe, and to understand the scope, distribution and diversity of European-based funding focused on women and girls. The study was conducted in 2010 by the Foundation Center and Weisblatt & associés, in cooperation with the European Foundation Centre.

While this study seeks to advance conversations about philanthropic support for women and girls, it also represents the most comprehensive study to date on the philanthropic activities of European foundations, in general. The study draws upon a rich mixture of survey, grants, and interview data to understand the range of foundation characteristics and interests, as well as their specific approaches to work related to women and girls.

Altogether, 145 foundations from 19 countries, diverse in their missions and size, participated in the study. Key findings from the study follow.

**KEY FINDINGS**

**Foundation Giving in General**

* Nearly three-quarters of European foundations surveyed (73 percent) are active in the area of education. In addition, about half of all foundations work in health (50 percent), arts and culture (49 percent) and community development (46 percent). Lower priority areas are religion (8 percent), public affairs (9 percent), and peace (11 percent).

* Children and youth are the top beneficiary population (74 percent) designated by European foundations. Significant numbers of foundations also work to benefit the economically disadvantaged (50 percent) and people with disabilities (48 percent). Lesbian, bisexual, and transgender populations were the least likely to be the beneficiaries of foundation activities (9 percent), followed by people with HIV/AIDS (12 percent).

**Foundation Giving to Women and Girls**

* About a third of the foundations in the survey sample (37 percent) reported that they engaged in at least some grantmaking or programmatic activities that were specifically intended to benefit women and girls. Nearly one in five foundations (19 percent) said that they explicitly named women or girls in their mission statement or grantmaking guidelines as a population group they seek to support.

* The majority of foundations surveyed (58 percent) allocated less than ten percent of their expenditures to programmes benefiting women and girls in 2009. This includes one-quarter that did not designate any funds to programmes intended to benefit women and girls.

* In 2009, the median percentage of total grant monies allocated by foundations in support of women and girls was 4.8 percent. The median percentage of the total number of grants allocated by foundations was 4.1 percent. These findings are based on analyses of more than 9,100 grants awarded by 42 foundations.

* Although only a third of foundations surveyed said they specifically intended some of their programmatic activities to reach women and girls, substantially higher numbers of foundations expressed interest in various issues affecting women and girls. Ninety percent of foundations expressed interest in at least one issue related to women and girls. On average, foundations endorsed eight issues of interest. Particularly high levels of interest were noted for violence against
women (74 percent), poverty among women and/or girls (73 percent), and women’s and/or girls’ access to education (71 percent).

- Lesbian, bisexual, and transgender rights generated the least interest among foundations surveyed (30 percent).

- Nearly half of all grants identified as benefiting women and girls were in the area of human services (45 percent). The second largest share of grants focused on human rights (21 percent).

- Foundations that engage in grantmaking or programmatic activities specifically intended to benefit women and girls were significantly more likely than other foundations to be involved in human rights and social justice-oriented grantmaking.

Foundation Approaches to Supporting Women and Girls

- There are multiple points of entry for foundations in this work, as foundations have different reasons for and approaches to supporting women and girls depending upon their missions, histories, and operating philosophies.

- Foundations take diverse approaches in their support of women and girls. Some foundations are directly engaged at the mission level and/or have a dedicated programme that focuses on women and girls. Others may not have a specific focus on women and girls, but integrate gender perspectives into their work nonetheless.

- Though there are challenges inherent in this work, foundations that have successfully supported women and girls have identified key practices that have contributed to effective engagement. These practices include: 1) developing strong board and executive staff leadership who understand the importance of giving to women and girls, 2) providing ongoing professional development for staff to build organisational capacity related to women and girls, 3) creating foundation practices, policies, and strategies that are flexible and adapted to fit the unique needs of organisations serving women and girls, and 4) paying close attention to the importance of data and impact.

ENDNOTES

3. Of note, the European Foundation Centre’s survey of its membership indicated that 13 percent of their member foundations targeted women and girls in their work, suggesting the present study overstates European foundation commitment to women and girls.
Though the philanthropic sector in Europe is expansive and far-reaching, numbering approximately 110,000 foundations with annual expenditures of €100 billion, surprisingly little is known about the breadth of European foundations, the nature of their work, or the allocation of their funds. Yet data are critical to informed decision-making and effective philanthropy. It is in that spirit that Mama Cash, the world’s oldest international women’s fund, commissioned this research study to understand the scope, distribution and diversity of European-based funding, with a specific focus on women and girls.

While this study seeks to advance conversations about philanthropic support for women and girls, it also represents the most comprehensive study to date on the philanthropic activities of European foundations, in general. The study draws upon a rich mixture of survey, grants, and interview data to understand the range of foundation characteristics and interests, as well as their specific approaches to work related to women and girls. It reveals the top funding priorities of these foundations—nearly three-quarters, for example, are active in education—and identifies the specific population groups foundations are most likely to target in their work. And to the best of our knowledge, it is the first study to examine in detail the grantmaking activities of a broad cross-section of European foundations.

 Altogether, 145 foundations from 19 countries, diverse in their missions and size, participated in the study. The vast majority of these foundations were independent or private, though corporate and public fundraising foundations also took part in the study. Foundations were evenly distributed across asset and expenditure groups.

The foundations in this study hold significant resources; we estimate (conservatively) that they control assets of more than €9.2 billion. Forty-two percent hold assets of at least €50 million apiece and the study includes nine of the top 50 foundations in Europe ranked by expenditures.

A number of these foundations are using their resources to support women and girls both on the continent and abroad in a variety of ways. They are funding projects that range from empowering women in Turkey to participate in local government, to promoting the financial independence of single mothers in Belgium, to preventing female genital mutilation in rural Kenya.

It’s clear that foundations have different reasons for and approaches to supporting women and girls based on their missions, histories, and operating philosophies. For some foundations, supporting women and girls is central to their mission, and they approach their work through the lens of human rights and social justice. For other foundations, explicit support for women and girls is not a part of their foundation’s primary mission. Yet they have come to adopt a gender lens in their work, with the understanding that paying attention to the experiences and socially constructed roles of women and girls enhances the effectiveness of their overall grantmaking.

Interviews with foundation executives shed light on some of the challenges foundations face in this work—from political concerns about publicly committing to support for women and girls to difficulties in measuring and articulating the impact of their investments—while also providing information about the practices they have adopted to counter these challenges and to work more creatively and effectively in their support of women and girls.

Our study shows that European foundations are already working in innovative and proactive ways to support women and girls. It also shows that many foundations are nominally or not at all engaged in this work. Yet, regardless of their current level of involvement, the vast majority of foundations we surveyed—90 percent—expressed some interest in supporting programmes benefiting women and girls, suggesting untapped opportunities to increase foundation engagement in support of women and girls.
In its annual ranking of countries based on gender equality, the World Economic Forum reports that no nation has yet achieved gender equality. North American and European/Central Asian countries have made the most progress, but on average, countries in these regions have only closed 70 percent of the gender gap, meaning that women have access to 70 percent of the economic, educational, health, and political resources and opportunities available to men. In other parts of the world, the gender gap is considerably larger—countries in the Middle East and North Africa trail the furthest behind, where only 58 percent of the gender gap has been closed.

The majority of the European foundations (66 percent) in our survey sample reported that their work was local or national in scope. A third of foundations (34 percent) indicated that their giving was internationally focused, particularly to countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. To provide context for this giving, we describe the overarching conditions for women and girls in both Europe and other regions of the world. While the picture that emerges is based on aggregate indicators, it is important to remember that women’s experiences—in any country—are also shaped and influenced by their economic status, racial and/or ethnic backgrounds, and sexual orientation, among other factors.

EUROPE

Like many other parts of the world, Europe has made significant strides in narrowing the gender gap within health and education domains. However, disparities in economic and political domains remain, with women receiving 65 percent and 18 percent, respectively, of the resources and opportunities available to men.

Within Europe, there is considerable geographic variation on indicators of gender equality. Nordic countries consistently rank high on all indicators, in part due to government policies that have supported women’s participation in the political arena, as well as family-friendly workplace policies, while Eastern and Central European countries tend to rank lower on measures of gender equality.

In all 27 EU countries, more women live below the poverty line than do men. A 2010 report by Oxfam International suggests that economic conditions for impoverished and migrant women in Europe are especially dire, prompting Oxfam to describe their predicament as an “invisible crisis.” Furthermore, poor and migrant women are more apt to feel the brunt of a fragile economy, accepting jobs below their qualifications and facing greater job insecurity.

While economic security is a telling indicator of women’s position in society, so too is their physical safety and well-being. Although reliable estimates are hard to generate, as many as a third of European women have been victims of domestic violence. Despite the prevalence of violence against women, laws among European countries about domestic violence, sexual assault, and rape vary, offering women differing levels of protection. Likewise, access to reproductive and sexual health services varies among European countries, and in Ireland, abortions continue to be restricted. In sum, while the status of women in Europe is improving in many respects, gender-based inequalities persist, underscoring the need for ongoing efforts to support the rights and well-being of women and girls.

BEYOND EUROPE

The struggle for gender equality is one that is occurring across nations and continents. As in Europe, there are signs of progress across the globe, as well as reminders that there is still much work to be done.

Countries in the Middle East and North Africa, for example, rank the lowest in the world overall on gender equality, due largely to disparities in economic and political domains. Only about 40 percent and 5 percent of the gap has been closed in these domains, respectively. Saudi Arabia, for example, ranks last in the world in the political participation of women. Only recently have a handful of women earned seats in government. Similarly, Yemen ranks last out of 134 countries in economic participation. There, women make up only 21 percent of the overall labour force, and only 2 percent of the professional workforce.

Interestingly, in sub-Saharan Africa, many countries have made substantive gains involving the economic and political participation of women. In 2008, Rwanda became the first country in the world to have a majority female parliament, and in South Africa, more than a third of ministry-level positions belong to women. Gender gaps related to economic participation in sub-Saharan Africa are comparable to the gaps found among European nations. But substantial disparities in education and health remain. Health conditions in Zimbabwe, for example, are so poor that the average life expectancy for women is only 38 years. At the same time, HIV/AIDS has taken an especially heavy toll on countries in sub-Saharan Africa, where the majority of those living with HIV/AIDS—59 percent—are women. Still there are bright spots in the region. For example, Lesotho and South Africa both rank among the top 15 countries in the world in gender equality, ahead of countries such as the United States and Canada.

In contrast to sub-Saharan Africa, in Latin America and the Caribbean, about half of the countries in the region have closed the gender gap in health, and several countries have closed the gender gap in education. In fact, in both domains, the region ranks above Europe. However, the region still has much progress to make on the economic and political status of women.

Asia Pacific has the smallest gap between men and women on political empowerment, and two countries in the region, Sri Lanka and New Zealand, rank in the top ten for women’s political empowerment. However, as in Africa, political empowerment does not always translate into tangible progress in the overall status and well-being of women. For example, India, home to one of the world’s largest economies, ranks 23rd in the world in the political empowerment of women, yet ranks near the bottom of the world’s countries on educational, economic, and health indicators for women.

ENDNOTES

1. The World Economic Forum’s “Gender Gap Index” measures the extent to which there is a gap between men and women in their access to resources and opportunities in health, economic, education, and political domains.
As foundation leaders, non-profit leaders, and policymakers discuss and debate the key findings from the study, we hope this publication can serve as a catalyst for new conversations across the continent, ultimately encouraging a wider range of actors to support funding for women and girls, while re-energising the work of those already engaged.

1.1 THE RESEARCH STUDY

Because even basic information about the “universe” of foundations is present in some parts of Europe and lacking in others, it was not possible in this study to gather strictly representative data on foundation activities that would be generalisable to foundations across Europe. Instead, this study triangulated information from a rich array of data sources—surveys, grants data, and interviews—to paint an emerging picture of European foundations’ engagement related to women and girls. The study sought to answer the following questions:

- To what extent are foundations engaged in funding women and girls?
- What issues related to women and girls are foundations interested in supporting and exploring?
- What approaches do foundations take to this work?

Due to the data collection challenges noted above, this research should be considered exploratory, rather than definitive. And because outreach for participation in the study explicitly noted the study’s focus on women and girls and relied on the generosity of individual staff members or volunteers to complete the survey, the study may have oversampled foundations with an interest in women and girls issues. For this reason, the results reported in this study may overstate the extent of European foundation support for women and girls. Findings from the study must be interpreted cautiously, with the understanding that the results reflect a particular slice of European foundations.

### TABLE 1. Description and Purpose of Data Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>14-item questionnaire administered in Spring 2010 to obtain basic information about foundation characteristics (type of foundation, assets, expenditures, etc.), as well as their programmatic foci, the population groups specified through their work, their interest in women and girls, and their current engagement with women and girls</td>
<td>To understand the range of foundation characteristics and interests</td>
<td>136 foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants analysis</td>
<td>Self-reported grants data for fiscal year 2009; information included recipient organisations, grant amounts, and grant descriptions indicating the purpose of the grant</td>
<td>To provide specific examples of foundations’ grantmaking benefiting women and girls</td>
<td>Analysis focused on 392 grants benefiting women and girls, culled from a sample of more than 9,100 total grants from 42 foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>In-depth interviews with foundation executives</td>
<td>To learn more about specific strategies and approaches to grantmaking targeting women and girls</td>
<td>6 foundations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Some foundations appear in multiple categories. Of the 42 foundations that shared their grants data, 33 also participated in the survey. Nine foundations shared their grants data only and did not take the survey. All six foundations that were interviewed also took the survey and five of the six shared their grants data.

### TABLE 2. Participating Foundations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation Characteristics</th>
<th>Survey Sample, N=136 (%)</th>
<th>Grants Sample, N=421 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Foundation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent/Private Foundation</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Foundation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Foundation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Fundraising Foundation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asset Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€250 million or more</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€50 million to just under €250 million</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€5 million to just under €50 million</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€500,000.000 to just under €5 million</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under €500.000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€5 million or more</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€1 million to just under €5 million</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under €1 million</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Foundation Center, Untapped Potential: European Foundation Funding For Women & Girls, 2011. Altogether 145 foundations participated in the study. Of the 42 foundations that shared their grants data, 33 also participated in the survey. Nine foundations shared their grants data only and did not take the survey. Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding and missing data.
Despite these caveats, this is the most comprehensive study conducted to date on European foundation support for women and girls. Of the 145 European foundations in this study, approximately 30 percent of participating foundations were members of the European Foundation Centre. Many of the participating foundations are also significant players in continental giving. Nine of the top 50 European foundations, ranked by expenditures, took part in this study, and we estimate (conservatively) that the studied foundations collectively control assets of more than €9.2 billion.

### 1.2 DATA SOURCES

Data were collected through three avenues (surveys, grants data, and interviews) to understand European foundations’ giving patterns and areas of interest, both in general and specifically related to foundation activities benefiting women and girls.\(^1\) Altogether, 145 foundations participated in this study.\(^2\) Data sources are described in Table 1.

The following section summarises the characteristics of foundations that participated in the survey, as well as the foundations that provided grants data and participated in the interviews. Results from the survey and grants data are presented in Chapters 2–4, while a synthesis of the interview data is presented in Chapter 5.

#### Survey Sample

Foundations were recruited in early 2010 for survey participation via the European Foundation Centre membership list, as well as through 26 national associations of foundations, including the Association of Charitable Foundations in the United Kingdom, the Associazione di Fondazioni e di Casse di Risparmio in Italy, and the Czech Donors Forum in the Czech Republic. Foundations belonging to 12 of the 26 national associations responded to the survey, and 30 percent of responding foundations were members of the European Foundation Centre. The foundations in the survey sample represent 19 countries and represent a variety of foundation types and foundation sizes. Nine of the top 50 European foundations (ranked by expenditures) participated in the survey.\(^3\)

The majority of the European foundations (66 percent) in our survey sample reported that their work was local or national in scope. A third of foundations (34 percent) indicated that their giving was internationally focused, particularly to countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

Additional characteristics of the survey sample by foundation type, geographic location, and foundation size are as follows (Table 2):
Approximately two-thirds of the survey sample (68 percent) consisted of independent/private foundations.

- Corporate foundations constituted 10 percent of the sample.
- Public/fundraising foundations comprised 7 percent of the sample, and were concentrated primarily in Eastern Europe. Only 3 percent of foundations in the sample were community foundations.
- Thirteen percent of the sample indicated that they were “other” types of foundations. Closer examination of these foundations revealed that the majority were Italian banking foundations.

Nearly half of the foundations surveyed (48 percent) were located in Western Europe.

- The United Kingdom accounted for the majority of Western European foundations included in the study.
- A quarter of the sample (24 percent) consisted of Southern European foundations, two-thirds of which were Italian foundations.
- Eastern European and Northern European foundations each comprised 14 percent of the survey sample; foundations from the Czech Republic constituted the largest proportion of Eastern European foundations and the bulk of Northern European foundations were from Finland.

Foundations were evenly distributed across asset and expenditure groups.

- 42 percent of foundations reported assets of €50 million or more, while 35 percent reported assets of less than €5 million.
- Slightly over a third of foundations (36 percent) reported charitable expenditures of €5 million or more, while the same number reported charitable expenditures of less than €1 million.
- The highest concentration of wealthier foundations was in Southern and Northern Europe—more than three-quarters (81 percent) of Southern European foundations and 63 percent of Northern European foundations had assets of €50 million or more.
- Conversely, 89 percent of foundations in Eastern Europe had assets of under €5 million.

Using a conservative estimate, foundations participating in the survey controlled assets of at least €9.2 billion in 2009.

- These same foundations reported expenditures totalling at least €1.4 billion in 2009.

Grants Sample

Foundations were invited to share their 2009 grants information with the Foundation Center so that the research team could learn more about specific foundation grants benefiting women and girls. To date, very few efforts had been made to gather grants-level data from European foundations. As such, we were pleased that 33 of the foundations that responded to the survey agreed to share their grants information with the Foundation Center for further coding and analysis. The Foundation Center also obtained grants information from nine foundations that did not participate in the survey, resulting in grants data for 42 foundations.

Foundations from 16 countries are represented in the grants sample. Like the survey sample, most of these foundations (71 percent) were independent/private foundations and about half (55 percent) were from Western Europe. The majority of foundations (57 percent) sharing their grants data for this research were larger foundations with expenditures of €5 million or more.

In total, the Foundation Center received information on more than 9,100 grants. Detailed coding and analysis revealed that 392 grants specifically targeted women and girls. The research team’s analytic efforts focused on these 392 grants.

While the grants data analysed in this study provide an important, additional layer of information for understanding the nature and scope of foundation giving by illuminating specific examples, only a small number of foundations were able to provide this data to the Foundation Center. Therefore, the analyses are descriptive in nature and should be interpreted cautiously.

Interviews

Five foundations and one collaborative initiative were selected for follow up interviews to learn more about specific foundation strategies and approaches in support of women and girls. These included the Bernard van Leer Foundation (the Netherlands); King Baudouin Foundation (Belgium); Oak Foundation (Switzerland); Sabanci Foundation (Turkey); Sigrid Rausing Trust (United Kingdom); and Learning Bridges Initiative—a collaboration among the Women’s Fund in Georgia, the Slovak-Czech Women’s Fund, and the Reconstruction Women’s Fund in Serbia.

Interviews focused on foundations’ rationale and methodology and were not intended to provide exhaustive reporting on all of their activities or goals. The interview sample represented a pan-European geographic spread, as well as diverse kinds of funders including independent, family, public or fundraising foundations.
**1.3 THIS REPORT**

Despite the limitations noted earlier this study is the most extensive research of its kind to be conducted in Europe. A 2010 study by the Association of Women’s Rights in Development (AWID) documented funding for 127 women’s rights organisations in Southeast Europe, Central and Eastern Europe, and the Commonwealth of Independent States, and a 2006 investigation by the European Foundation Centre mapped the interests and work of 28 foundations focused on gender issues in Europe⁷, but to date no other study has attempted to document the scope, distribution, and diversity of giving for women and girls by a broad cross-section of European foundations. The findings presented in this report, thus, serve as a critical starting point for conversation, as the field seeks to advance both research and practice related to women and girls.

**ENDNOTES**

1. For the purpose of this research project, we sought to collect data across a range of European foundations. The research covers foundations based in the EU member states (including Norway and Switzerland), Central and Eastern Europe, the South Caucasus, and Turkey.

2. In addition, ten women's funds participated in the study—six provided survey and grants data, two provided only survey data, and two provided only grants data. For the purposes of this report, women's funds are analysed separately since their activities, by definition, focus on women and girls exclusively.


4. Italian foundations of banking origin were the result of the country’s banking reforms in the 1990’s that separated the philanthropic activities of banks from their credit activities. Currently, there are 88 Italian foundations of banking origin.

5. The extent to which some countries are better represented in the sample than others is due largely to the study's sampling methodology, which relied on the cooperation of national associations of donors.

6. Grants were obtained as part of a separate Foundation Center research project.

7. Eight of the 28 foundations were based in the United States, but were included in the study because they are members of the European Foundation Centre.
While this study seeks to advance conversations about philanthropic support for women and girls, it also provides important and new information about the philanthropic activities of European foundations, in general. This chapter reports on the programme areas in which European foundations work and the population groups they seek to support through their activities. Patterns by region and foundation size are noted.

### 2.1 PROGRAMME AREAS

- Nearly three-quarters of foundations are active in the area of education, making it the top funding priority by a large margin.
- Several distinctive patterns emerged within regions—Southern European foundations were the most likely to focus on arts and culture, Northern European foundations on science and technology, Western European foundations on immigration, migration, and integration, and Eastern European foundations on civil society, law, and rights.

Education stands as the top priority area among European foundations. When foundations were asked to select the areas in which they work from a list of 19 subjects, nearly three-quarters (73 percent) cited education as one of their grantmaking or programmatic areas (Table 3). Roughly half of foundations reported activity in the areas of health (50 percent), arts and culture (49 percent), and community development (46 percent).¹

About two in five foundations worked in the following areas: human/social services (43 percent), philanthropy (39 percent), the environment (38 percent), and immigration, migration, and integration (38 percent).

A smaller number of foundations reported working on issues related to religion (8 percent), public affairs (9 percent), and peace (11 percent) (Table 4).

**Programmatic Focus by Region**

When the sample was disaggregated by region, education and health ranked among the top five cited programmatic foci by foundations in all regions (Table 5). At the same time, there were also notable regional differences.

- Issues of *immigration, migration, and integration* ranked second among Western European foundations as an area of work with 45 percent of foundations reporting engagement in these issues, higher than any other region.
In Northern Europe, nearly two-thirds of foundations (63 percent) indicated that their foundation activities sought to support science and technology, making it the number one ranked issue in the region. In stark contrast, less than 10 percent of foundations in Western Europe and Eastern Europe reported investments in science and technology.

Arts and culture ranked second in Northern Europe, with more than half of foundations working in the area. Arts and culture also ranked second among Southern European foundations as a grantmaking area, with 91 percent of foundations supporting initiatives in the area.

Compared to other regions, foundation activities related to civil society, law and rights ranked particularly high among Eastern European foundations, with more than a third of Eastern European foundations (37 percent) engaged in this area of work.

Programmatic Focus by Total Charitable Expenditures

For analytic purposes, foundations were sorted into three expenditure groups—€5 million or more (large foundations), €1 million to just under €5 million (mid-sized foundations), and under €1 million (small foundations). Across all three expenditure groups, education and health were among the five most frequently cited areas of work. Education ranked as the top subject area for all three groups, with 65 to 78 percent of foundations endorsing education as a focus of their activities. The percent of foundations engaged in health issues ranged from 37 percent to 63 percent across the three groups. Not surprisingly, larger foundations were more likely to endorse grantmaking in a greater number of subject areas, whereas smaller foundations, whose work is likely to be more specialised, endorsed fewer areas.

### TABLE 3. Top 10 Grantmaking/Programmatic Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Percent of Foundations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human/Social Services</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration/Integration</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society, Law and Rights</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### TABLE 4. Bottom 10 Grantmaking/Programmatic Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Percent of Foundations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation and Sports</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Affairs/Development</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### TABLE 5. Top Grantmaking/Programmatic Areas, by Region

#### Western Europe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Programmatic Area</th>
<th>Percent of Foundations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Immigration/Migration/Integration</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Human/Social Services</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


#### Southern Europe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Programmatic Area</th>
<th>Percent of Foundations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Eastern Europe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Programmatic Area</th>
<th>Percent of Foundations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Environment, Law and Rights</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 SPECIFIED POPULATION GROUPS

- Half of surveyed foundations said that all or most of their programmatic activities are intended to reach specific population groups.

- Children and youth are the most frequently specified population group (74 percent).

- Just over one-third of foundations (37 percent) said at least some of their programmatic activities are specifically intended to benefit women and girls.

Many foundations specify particular population groups in their grantmaking or programmatic activities. This is one indicator of how important the groups are to the foundation’s activities and to what extent foundations are likely to devote resources to these groups. Half of foundations in the survey sample indicated that all or most of their foundation activities designated a specific population group. Only 10 percent of foundations indicated that none of their activities designated a specific population group (Figure 2).

Consistent with the high prevalence of foundations working on educational issues, foundations participating in this survey were most likely to specify children and youth (74 percent) as a population group targeted in their work. Other population groups specified by at least one-third of foundations include the economically disadvantaged (50 percent), people with disabilities (48 percent), the aging/elderly (43 percent), women and/or girls (37 percent), and immigrant/refugee communities (33 percent) (Figure 3).

In a 2009 survey of EFC membership, which numbered 236 foundations at the time, approximately 13 percent of foundations indicated they intentionally specified women and girls in their work, suggesting that our methodology likely oversampled foundations interested in women and girls.

### TABLE 6. Top Grantmaking/Programmatic Areas, by Total Charitable Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Foundations with Expenditures of €5 million or more</th>
<th>Percent of Foundations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arts and Culture</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Human/Social Services</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Foundations with Expenditures of €1 million to Under €5 million</th>
<th>Percent of Foundations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Human/Social Services</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Philanthropy</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Foundations with Expenditures of Under €1 million</th>
<th>Percent of Foundations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Civil Society, Law and Rights</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### FIGURE 2. Foundation Activities Benefiting Specific Population Groups
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### FIGURE 3. Population Groups Benefiting from Foundations’ Grantmaking Programmatic Activities
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Source: The Foundation Center, Untapped Potential: European Foundation Funding For Women & Girls, 2011. Based on a survey of 136 European independent, corporate, and public/fundraising foundations. Note: “Other population groups” included a range of groups, including victims of crime, rural populations, and people with dementia. A quarter of “other population groups” specified were prisoners.
### TABLE 7. Top Population Groups, by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Western Europe</th>
<th>Percent of Foundations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Children/Youth</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Immigrant/Refugee Communities</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Women and/or Girls</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aging/Elderly/Senior Citizens</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>People with Disabilities</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Southern Europe</th>
<th>Percent of Foundations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Children/Youth</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>People with Disabilities</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aging/Elderly/Senior Citizens</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Immigrant/Refugee Communities</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Women and/or Girls</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Eastern Europe</th>
<th>Percent of Foundations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Children/Youth</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>People with Disabilities</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aging/Elderly/Senior Citizens</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Women and/or Girls</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Northern Europe</th>
<th>Percent of Foundations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Children/Youth</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other Population Group</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>People with Disabilities</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aging/Elderly/Senior Citizens</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Women and/or Girls</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Specified Population Groups by Region

Children and youth ranked first in all four regions, although there was a substantial range, from 66 percent of Western European foundations to 84 percent of Southern European foundations (Table 7). Western European foundations were most likely to specify women and girls in their foundation’s work (40 percent), followed by Eastern Europe (39 percent), Southern Europe (34 percent), and Northern Europe (18 percent).

It is not clear why the percentage of Northern European foundations engaged in work related to women and girls is considerably lower than the other regions, although there are several possible explanations. Only 11 of the Northern European foundations responded to this question, so the survey sample may not capture the full range of work by Northern European foundations on women and girls. Of the Northern European foundations that did respond to the question, almost half were foundations with a research focus and tended to direct only “some” of their funding to particular population groups or had highly specific populations that they targeted, such as students. Alternately, another explanation may be that studies of international gender inequality consistently rate Nordic countries as the most egalitarian in the world, in part due to progressive government policies. Thus, for the Northern European foundations in this sample, which overwhelmingly described their work as national or local in scope (rather than international), support for women and girls may not be a high priority, given that the government plays such a strong role in supporting women.

### Specified Population Groups by Total Charitable Expenditures

Across all three expenditure groups, children and youth were the population group most likely to be specified as a focus of foundation activities (Table 8). Virtually all of the largest foundations, those with giving of €5 million or more, specified children and youth as intended beneficiaries of their work (93 percent).

About 40 percent of large and mid-sized foundations reported that they specified women and girls as intended beneficiaries in their grantmaking or programmatic activities. Thirty-four percent of foundations with expenditures of under €1 million designated at least some of their work in support of women and girls.

### ENDNOTES

1. The percentage of foundations supporting education, health, and community development are comparable to the areas of focus reported by EFC membership (2009). In contrast, about 70 percent of EFC’s membership indicated involvement in arts and culture, compared to 49 percent in the current sample. It is not clear whether the current study under-represents the proportion of European foundations working in this area or whether the EFC membership data over-represents them.

2. Though not in the top five, a similar percentage of Southern European foundations were involved in grantmaking and programming related to science and technology. This is due in part to the large number of Italian banking foundations in Southern Europe, whose legal statutes stipulate work on issues related to science and technology (European Foundation Centre, 2009).
One of the central questions guiding this project was to understand the scope and diversity of foundation support for women and girls. To this end, foundation engagement in support of women and girls can be understood in various ways:

1. Programmatic expenditures benefiting women and girls
2. Level of interest in specific issues affecting women and girls
3. The intentionality with which foundation activities focus on women and girls

While actual expenditures represent, in a very important sense, the “bottom line” in terms of foundation engagement, strategies and practices are also deeply contingent upon topical interests and intentionality.

### 3.1 EXPENDITURES BENEFITING WOMEN AND GIRLS

- Most of the surveyed foundations devoted less than 10 percent of their expenditures in support of women and girls.
- Among the 42 foundations that provided grants data, the median percentage of total grant monies that were allocated in support of women and girls was 4.8 percent.

Both the grants data and the survey data provide insights into foundation expenditures benefiting women and girls. Foundations responding to the survey were asked to estimate the percentage of their total charitable expenditures that were specifically intended to benefit women and girls. For the grants sample, a subset of foundations shared information about all of the grants they awarded in 2009, including award amounts. Thus, it was possible to determine the percentage of grantmaking in support of women and girls for these foundations.

#### Survey Data

According to the survey, a quarter of foundations reported that they do not allocate any of their expenditures to projects or programmes specifically intended to benefit women and girls (Figure 4). Another third of the sample designated between 1 and 9 percent of foundation expenditures, meaning that 58 percent of the foundations surveyed awarded less than 10 percent of their expenditures to programmes benefiting women and girls. Thirteen percent of the respondents in the sample were uncertain of their foundation’s allocation to projects or programmes specifically intended to benefit women and girls.

#### Grants Data

Like the survey data, an analysis of the grants data showed that the percentage of foundation expenditures reaching women and girls ranged widely, from none to 84 percent, with a median of 4.8 percent. The 392 grants benefiting women and girls

---

**FIGURE 4. Estimated Percentage of Expenditures Benefiting Women and Girls**
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Comparative Data from the United States

To provide a point of reference to European foundation giving data presented in this report, we look to the United States, where more comprehensive grants information has been collected. The distribution of foundation expenditures in support of women and girls is similar between the U.S. and Europe. The largest proportion of foundations in both the United States and Europe designated between 1 to 9 percent of grants and grant monies to women and girls. Although there are comparatively more European foundations that fall into the 25 percent to 49 percent range for grants awarded (14 percent of European foundations versus 2 percent of U.S. foundations) and expenditures (9 percent of European foundations versus 2 percent of U.S. foundations), these differences are likely due to the small size of the European sample and the fact that it likely oversampled foundations engaged in funding women and girls.

Grants data from 42 European foundations showed the median percentage of expenditures and number of grants awarded are 4.8 percent and 4.1 percent, respectively. In the United States, 7 percent of all grants and grant dollars specifically designated women and girls in 2009.1

1U.S. figures are averages, while the European figures represent medians.

3.2 INTEREST IN ISSUES AFFECTING WOMEN AND GIRLS

- Violence against women, poverty among women and girls, and women’s and girls’ access to education emerged as the top three issues of interest to European foundations.

As another measure of their engagement with women and girls, all foundations participating in the survey were asked...
to indicate their interest in 19 different issues pertaining to women and girls based on a three-point scale (very interested, somewhat interested, or not interested). Interestingly, while 62 percent of foundations in the sample had designated at least some of their expenditures for women and girls, a much larger proportion of the sample—90 percent—expressed interest in at least one of the 19 issues. On average, foundations expressed interest in eight of the 19 issues.

Leading areas of interest included violence against women (74 percent), poverty (73 percent), and access to education (71 percent) (Table 9). Issues generating the least amount of interest were lesbian, bisexual, and transgender rights (30 percent of foundations expressed interest), women’s and girls’ access to media (37 percent), and women and girls in sports (38 percent).

To derive an indicator that would denote the degree to which foundations were interested in various issues, a net score was computed by subtracting “not interested” responses from “very interested” responses. A negative net score does not necessarily indicate that a foundation is not interested in a particular issue; rather, it suggests that the intensity of their interest is lower.

Consistent with findings based on the overall preferences of survey respondents, the two issues with a positive net interest across all European foundations were violence against women and women’s and girls’ access to education. Poverty among women and girls ranked third. These three areas, then, are the ones most likely to engage the attention of foundations in general, regardless of their present level of involvement in foundation work related to women and girls.

The next section examines foundations’ interest in issues affecting women and girls in the context of the intentionality with which they approach their work.

### 3.3 The “Intentionality” of Foundation Funding for Women and Girls

- Nearly one in five foundations specifically name women and girls in their mission statement or grantmaking guidelines.
- Close to one in five foundations give grants or engage in programmatic activities explicitly designated to benefit women and girls, but do not name them in their mission statement or grantmaking guidelines.
- Foundations whose work in support of women and girls was intentional were more likely than other foundations to fund human rights and social justice initiatives.

While most surveyed foundations (62 percent) indicated that at least a portion of their programmatic expenditures benefitted women and girls, foundations differed considerably in terms of the “intentionality” they bring to this work. What does it mean for foundations to do this work intentionally? And how does intentionality influence the way foundations approach issues affecting women and girls?

Foundations can signal intentionality in various ways. Some foundations explicitly name women or girls in their mission statement or grantmaking guidelines as a population group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Very Interested</th>
<th>Somewhat Interested</th>
<th>Not Interested</th>
<th>Net (V-N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violence Against Women</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s and/or Girls’ Access to Education</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty among Women and/or Girls</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Women and/or Girls (in general)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Issues Affecting Women and/or Girls</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Immigrant and/or Refugee Women</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s and/or Girls’ Leadership Development</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging Issues Affecting Women</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafficking of Women and/or Girls</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Entrepreneurs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s and/or Girls’ Labour Rights</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Empowerment of Women</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Philanthropy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in the Sciences</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of War and Armed Conflict on Women and/or Girls</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Women and/or Girls in Religious or Fundamentalist Contexts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s and/or Girls’ Access to Media/Freedom of Expression</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women and/or Girls in Sports</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian, Bisexual, and/or Transgender Rights</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Shaded items indicate endorsement from at least half of foundations, based on a sum of “very interested” and “somewhat interested.”
they support. For example, the Sigrid Rausing Trust (profiled in Chapter 5), a U.K. based foundation whose work centres on supporting international human rights and has four programmatic areas in support of that mission, including one that focuses on women’s rights. In other words, the foundation’s commitment to supporting women and girls is explicitly integrated into its organisational structure. Altogether, one in five foundations surveyed (19 percent) named women or girls in their mission statement or grantmaking guidelines as a group they support (Figure 7).

Even if foundations do not mention women or girls in their mission statement or grantmaking guidelines, they may nevertheless give grants or engage in programmatic activities that are specifically designated to benefit women and girls. For example, one foundation in our survey sample that did not indicate a commitment to women and girls at the mission level noted that through its programme on safety and justice, which focuses on issues such as domestic abuse and sexual violence, many of their grants are specifically intended to benefit women and girls. Such foundations make up eighteen percent of the survey sample.

Interest in Women and Girls by Engagement Type

By explicitly specifying women and girls as a group it intends to serve—either at the organisational level or through specific grants or programmatic activities—a foundation signals a conscious commitment to that area of work—one that translates into tangible investments, financial or otherwise, in support of women and girls. Altogether, 35 percent of the foundations in our survey sample signalled this type of intentional engagement with women and girls (Figure 8). In the following analyses, we refer to these foundations as demonstrating “intentional engagement” with respect to women and girls.

Beyond these foundations, there are others that occasionally designate some grants or activities to women and girls even though they do not view women and girls as a population that they typically serve. We refer to these foundations as demonstrating “incidental engagement” in their work with women and girls. About a third (32 percent) of the surveyed foundations fell into this category.

Lastly, there is a group of foundations that did not allocate any expenditures specifically intended to benefit women and girls. These foundations are referred to as having “no engagement” with women and girls. About one-quarter (24 percent) of the surveyed foundations fell into this category.

This classification scheme provides us with a tool to understand the diversity of foundation engagement related to women and girls. As expected, foundations that expressed an explicit commitment to women and girls by naming them in their mission, grantmaking guidelines, and/or programmatic activities endorsed high levels of interest across a wide range of topics relevant to women and girls. While foundations demonstrating incidental engagement or no engagement expressed lower levels of interest, a critical mass of foundations in these groups still indicated interest in a number of issues related to women and girls. (For a complete list of interest in issues by engagement type, see Appendix A.) Each category included a mix of foundation types, diverse in foundation size and region. Across the three categories, distinctive patterns surface. Of note:

- More than half (54 percent) of intentionally engaged foundations designated 10 percent or more of their expenditures to women and girls, compared to 30 percent of incidentally engaged foundations.
- Foundations with intentional engagement were twice as likely as foundations with incidental engagement to be involved with human rights work.
Violence against women and women’s health issues garnered high levels of interest among both intentionally and incidentally engaged foundations, while no engagement foundations prioritized access to education and women in the sciences.

**Funding for Women and Girls**

As noted earlier, foundations’ monetary investments are an important indicator of their commitment to women and girls. Foundations that are intentional in their commitment are more likely to designate a larger proportion of their expenditures to women and girls. In fact, nearly a third of foundations (29 percent) that demonstrate intentional engagement designate 25 percent or more of their expenditures for women and girls (Figure 9).

A detailed examination of intentionally engaged foundations with giving in the 1 to 9 percent range revealed that most of these foundations were large foundations with as many as eight to ten programmatic areas of work. Given the breadth and scope of work conducted by these foundations, expenditures in the 1 to 9 percent range are likely to represent a substantial foundation commitment to women and girls. Moreover, given the size of these foundations, even 5 percent of expenditures may be far larger in absolute monetary terms than the contributions of a small foundation that allocates 50 percent of its expenditures for women and girls.

In comparison to foundations that express intentional support of women and girls, the majority of foundations that demonstrate incidental engagement (58 percent) designate between 1 and 9 percent of their expenditures to women and girls. While intentionally engaged foundations that gave in this range were primarily large, incidentally engaged foundations that gave in this range were a mix of small, mid-sized, and large foundations. Sixteen percent of incidentally engaged foundations gave between 10 and 24 percent of their expenditures to women and girls, while 14 percent gave more than 25 percent.
Subject Area Focus by Type of Engagement Affecting Women and Girls

Foundations with intentional engagement were significantly more likely than foundations with incidental or no engagement to be involved in certain areas of work. These subject areas were: human rights, immigration/migration/integration, peace, social justice, and health.

Women's rights advocates have long emphasized the need to address gender inequities in the areas of human rights, social justice, and health, so perhaps it is not surprising to see a “gender lens” employed by grantmakers in each of these areas. More recently, as the pivotal roles that women play regarding both the social integration of immigrants and promoting peace have become more widely understood, grantmakers have begun to invest in gender-based strategies in these areas as well.

Across most other subject areas, though, these differences were not as pronounced. For example, foundations with no engagement or incidental engagement were just as likely to be involved in education as intentionally engaged foundations. Approximately 70 percent of foundations in both groups were involved in supporting education programmes. Similarly, about 16 percent of foundations in both groups funded the social sciences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Cited by Intentional Engagement Foundations (%)</th>
<th>Cited by Incidental/No Engagement Foundations (%)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration/Migration/Integration</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>+29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>+27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>+18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Issue Areas of Interest**

With respect to issue areas of interest, an interesting pattern of similarities and differences emerged across the three types of engagement. Violence against women and health issues affecting women and girls both ranked among the top three issue areas of interest for intentionally and incidentally engaged foundations. No engagement foundations, on the other hand, expressed the most interest in access to education and women in the sciences.

Women's and girls' access to media/freedom of expression generated low levels of interest across all three engagement types, though the range was wide. Only 9 percent of no engagement foundations expressed interest in this issue, while 46 percent of intentionally engaged foundations indicated interest. Lesbian, bisexual, and transgender rights were among the bottom three issues of interest for no engagement and incidental engagement foundations, with 4 percent and 32 percent of foundations expressing interest, respectively. Lesbian, bisexual, and transgender rights ranked fourth from the bottom among intentionally engaged foundations, though more than half of the foundations in this category (53 percent) said they were interested in this issue.

**Level of Interest**

As might be expected, foundations' level of interest in issues related to women and girls was strong among intentionally engaged foundations, moderate among incidentally engaged foundations, and weak (yet present) among no engagement foundations. More than half of intentionally engaged foundations expressed interest in 14 of the 19 issues asked about in the survey, with particularly high levels of interest in six of the identified issues. Among incidentally engaged foundations, more than half expressed interest in 11 of the 19 issues, with a high level of interest in one issue—violence against women.

In contrast, foundations without any demonstrated engagement related to women and girls did not express strong interest in any of the issues, although more than half of the foundations in this category indicated interest in two of the issues identified—access to education and women in the sciences. Interestingly, a closer examination of the pattern of responses showed that only four of the 33 foundations in this category did not express interest in any issue related to women and girls. These four foundations were highly specialized in their missions, and perhaps did not see a direct connection between their work and issues related to women and girls. However, the vast majority of foundations in the no engagement category endorsed interest in a select few issue areas, strongly aligned with their foundation’s mission. This suggests that even among foundations that have not traditionally been engaged in work related to women and girls, or among those that have relatively narrow foci, there are points of entry for engagement.

**ENDNOTES**

1. For foundations involved in supporting programmes, direct grantmaking may not accurately represent total foundation expenditures in support of women and girls.
2. As a point of reference, in the United States, where more comprehensive research has been conducted, in 2009, about seven percent of all grants and grant dollars targeted women and girls. See sidebar on p. 12.
3. The percentage of foundations demonstrating “intentional engagement” does not correspond exactly with sample aggregates due to the exclusion of 12 unclassifiable foundations in this portion of the analysis.
4. When clear trends by region, foundation type, or foundation size emerge, they are noted in Table 10.
Among 42 foundations studied, nearly half of grants identified as benefiting women and girls focused on human and social services.

About a fifth of grants benefiting women and girls centred on human rights.

Of the 42 foundations that provided grants data for this project, 35 made at least one grant benefiting women and girls. Altogether, our research identified 392 such grants (out of a total of more than 9,100).

For this study, the Foundation Center coded grants on several dimensions, including the primary subject area of focus, the type of support provided by the foundation, and the population group(s) benefiting from the grant. Grants were coded based on grant descriptions provided by the foundation. In some cases, there were no descriptions, and in other cases, descriptions were not detailed enough to code the grant. Thus, not all grants identified as benefiting women and girls could be coded for subject area and/or type of support.

Of the 392 grants identified as benefiting women and girls, 306 (78 percent) were made by Western European foundations, 45 by Southern European foundations, 29 by Eastern European foundations, and 12 by Northern European foundations. The results presented in this section, therefore, largely reflect the grantmaking priorities of Western European foundations. (For a foundation by foundation breakdown of grants to women and girls by subject area, see Appendix B.)

Nearly half (45 percent) of the grants identified as benefiting women and girls fell into the area of human and social services (Figure 10). Of the 35 foundations in the grants sample that made at least one grant benefiting women and girls, 21 awarded grants in this area. In this section, we take a closer look at these grants, as well as grantmaking in the areas of civil and human rights, health, arts and culture, and education. Initiatives benefiting women and girls in other subject areas are also briefly summarised.
Human and Social Services Funding Benefiting Women and Girls

Almost half of the 392 grants (45 percent) reaching women and girls were in the area of human services. Human services are defined broadly and encompass activities such as social services, housing, public safety, youth development, and public protection and legal services.

OVERVIEW
◆ 176 grants made by 20 foundations
◆ Grants outside of Europe include grants in India, Republic of the Democratic Congo, and Tanzania
◆ 126 grants for programme support, 15 grants for capital support, 20 grants for general/operating support

AREAS OF WORK
◆ domestic violence
◆ child care/child well-being/support for mothers
◆ support for women’s centres
◆ integration support for immigrant and refugee women
◆ sexual abuse and exploitation
◆ support for and rehabilitation of women offenders

EXAMPLES
◆ A third of grants within human services focused on domestic violence. Domestic violence grants covered multiple dimensions of the issue, including the psychological, legal, and housing needs of domestic violence survivors. Some grants focused on particular communities such as the LBT population, the elderly, and immigrant women.
◆ Twenty grants coded as human services provided child-rearing support for mothers, particularly for vulnerable groups, such as homeless women, single mothers, or mothers living with HIV.
◆ A critical mass of grants supported women’s centres providing a variety of services and supports to women. Many of these grants were for general operating support, rather than programme support.

Human and Civil Rights Funding Benefiting Women and Girls

A fifth of the 392 grants (21 percent) in this sample were in the area of human rights. Twenty foundations across the four regions made human rights investments.

OVERVIEW
◆ 84 grants made by 20 foundations
◆ Grants outside of Europe include grants in South Africa, Zimbabwe, Pakistan, and Liberia
◆ 68 grants for programme support, 8 grants for capital support, 2 grants for general/operating support

AREAS OF WORK
◆ awareness of gender equality and women’s rights via trainings and advocacy
◆ development of women’s centres
◆ female genital mutilation
◆ advocacy for sexual/reproductive rights
◆ human trafficking
◆ domestic violence
◆ support related to integration for refugee and immigrant women

EXAMPLES
◆ Issues such as domestic violence and trafficking overlapped with grants made in the human and social services area. However, rather than providing direct services to women, these grants focused on efforts to increase awareness of gender inequalities and women’s rights among different constituencies, including policymakers, media, and women themselves. For instance, a grant in Poland supported efforts to analyse gender equality in public television programming.
◆ At least two British foundations—a small foundation and a large foundation working in partnership—had a strong focus on female genital mutilation and devoted substantial resources to this issue. Grants supported policy campaigns and grassroots community outreach to youth and their families to raise awareness about the harmful effects of the practice.
Health FundingBenefiting Women and Girls

Eight percent of the 392 grants were in the area of health. Fourteen of the 35 foundations making at least one grant benefiting women and girls awarded health grants.

OVERVIEW
- 33 grants made by 14 foundations
- Grants outside of Europe include grants in Zimbabwe, Nigeria, Kenya, El Salvador, Cape Verde, and Jordan
- 27 grants for programme support, 3 grants for capital support, 3 grants for general/operating support

AREAS OF WORK
- access to health services
- provision of psychosocial/mental health support
- prevention and treatment of HIV/AIDS
- breast cancer research, diagnosis, and support
- reproductive health
- services and support for maternal and infant health

EXAMPLES
- Some of the largest health grants were awarded for the prevention and treatment of HIV/AIDS in countries like Uganda and Zimbabwe, where cases of HIV/AIDS are higher among women and girls than men and boys. Given the prevalence of HIV among women, several projects also sought to stem transmission of the disease from mother to child.
- Other grants were directed toward illnesses such as breast cancer. One grant by a large Western European foundation covered the cost of a mobile mammogram unit in Jordan to increase access to early detection, while several other grants supported research for new treatments. At least two grants in this category supported programmes providing psychosocial support for women following treatment for breast cancer.
- Several grants focused on the mental health needs of women, including one that provided psychosocial support for Tamil and Zimbabwean refugees living in the UK.

Arts and Culture Funding Benefiting Women and Girls

Eight percent of the 392 grants benefiting women and girls were in the area of arts and culture.

OVERVIEW
- 31 grants made by 9 foundations
- 27 grants for programme support, 1 grant for general/operating support, 2 grants for capital support

AREAS OF WORK
- Raising awareness of issues affecting women and girls via art
- Providing opportunities for women and girls to participate in the arts

EXAMPLES
- Grants focused on multiple disciplines, including drama, music, dance, and art.
- Foundations recognized the potential to raise awareness among the general public about controversial topics via artistic avenues. One large Western European foundation awarded a grant for an art project to highlight issues and discrimination faced by lesbian refugees in London, with the hopes of creating a more open forum to discuss issues and to increase understanding and awareness. Similarly, another large Western European foundation supported the development of a documentary to bring attention to the plight of domestic workers.
- Grants in this area also supported the involvement of women themselves in artistic disciplines. One grant by an Italian foundation supported a women’s orchestra, while another funded a travelling cinema.
Education Funding Benefiting Women and Girls

Of the 392 women and girls’ grants in the sample, four percent of grants were education-related.

OVERVIEW
- 17 grants made by 8 foundations
- Grants outside of Europe include grants in Tanzania and Peru
- 11 grants for programme support, 3 grants for capital support

AREAS OF WORK
- access to education
- workshops and trainings
- after-school activities

EXAMPLES
- Though education consistently ranked as a top area of work by European foundations generally and women’s access to education ranked highly as an area of interest, this sample of women’s and girls’ grants showed comparatively modest levels of engagement. This may be because many education grants benefit both genders and thus, were not coded as specifically benefiting women and girls.
- Several education grants focused on issues of access. One mid-sized Swiss foundation, for example, aimed to create pathways to higher education for Tanzanian girls. Other grants provided support for workshops and trainings designed to improve literacy and technology skills among women.

Other Funding Benefiting Women and Girls

Our grants sample also included grants in a number of other subject areas, including science, recreation, community development, employment, social sciences, religion and public affairs. Foundations in our sample awarded six or fewer grants benefiting women and girls in each of these areas. With the exception of community development, these findings are consistent with the study’s findings about foundation engagement in different subject areas, which showed relatively low levels of involvement in these topics. In total, there were 23 grants in these areas combined—the largest number of grants was in the sciences (6). All six grants in the sciences were made by a single Western European foundation that provided lab equipment to various girls’ schools. Five grants were made in the area of community development. One notable community development grant was a large grant of €130,000 by an Eastern European foundation which sought to provide training, mentoring, and technological resources to more than a 1,000 aspiring women entrepreneurs.

ENDNOTES
1. The subject areas discussed in this chapter generally correspond to the programme areas referenced in Chapter 2 and elsewhere in the report. However, grants are coded based on an established taxonomy and some programme areas such as social justice and immigration/migration/integration are not considered major subject areas in the taxonomy.
2. Totals for type of support may not equal total number of grants due to lack of detail in grant descriptions.
Women’s funds aim to support and to fund women-led solutions to the root causes of social injustice. They seek to engage a broad range of constituents at multiple levels beyond grantmaking, such as linking and networking within and across sectors, and provide critical research and expertise for policy makers. Women’s funds also seek to alter power relations within the field of philanthropy. Not only do women’s funds work to invert power relations, women’s funds also seek to democratize the field more broadly so that all stakeholders (women’s groups, foundations, and individual donors) view themselves as partners with valued roles to play in making positive change in the lives of women and girls. (From Mama Cash’s Women’s Funds Programme Framework)

As the description above from Mama Cash highlights, women’s funds represent a distinctive and strategic type of philanthropic giving to women and girls—one that not only seeks to provide funding for organisations benefiting women and girls, but also aims to catalyse structural changes in the field. Though they tend to be small in size, because of their grassroots nature and their close relationships with grantee organisations, women’s funds often focus on supporting organisations that serve the poorest and most marginalized populations.

SURVEY RESULTS

The eight women’s funds that responded to the survey were located in seven different countries, the majority (5) in Eastern Europe. Two women’s funds were located in Southern Europe and one in Western Europe.

- Half of the women’s funds were independent/private foundations, while the other half identified themselves as public/fundraising foundations.
- Most women’s funds were small in size—seven of the eight women’s funds reported assets of under €500,000 and six of the eight reported expenditures of under €250,000.
- The majority of women’s funds (five out of the eight) described their work as international in scope, compared to about a third of foundations in the overall sample.
- All eight of the women’s funds reported that their grantmaking and programmatic activities encompassed the following subject areas: social justice, human rights, and civil society, law, and rights.
- The lesbian, bisexual, and transgender community ranked second to women and girls as a population group designated by women’s funds. Five of the eight women’s funds specifically designated the LBT community in their work.
- Women’s funds expressed wide-ranging interest in a variety of issues related to women and girls—all eight women’s funds expressed high levels of interest in 13 of the 19 issue areas asked about in the survey, and seven of the eight women’s funds were interested in three other issue areas. Women and girls in sports garnered the least amount of interest (five of the eight women’s funds expressed interest).

GRANTS DATA

The Foundation Center received grants data from eight women’s funds, representing four foundations from Eastern Europe, three from Western Europe, and one from Southern Europe. Seven of the eight were small foundations, while one was a mid-sized foundation. Collectively, the eight women’s funds awarded 281 grants.

- The largest proportion of grants (35 percent) fell in the area of human rights.1
  - In the area of human rights, the work of women’s funds focused on empowerment and anti-discrimination initiatives for a range of population groups, including disabled women, domestic workers, lesbian and transgender individuals, and sex workers. In addition to the issue of gender equality generally, grants in this area touched on issues such as sexual and reproductive rights and women’s property rights.
- About a quarter (26 percent) of grants were in the area of human services.
  - Many human services grants also focused on the rights of women, but these grants tended to incorporate direct services for women as well. Examples include grants supporting social activities for internally displaced women, educational and cultural activities for street girls, psychosocial supports for homeless women, and services for survivors of domestic violence.
- Grantmaking in all other subject areas, including health and education, totalled less than five percent of grants awarded by women’s funds.
- Two-thirds of grants by women’s funds were for programme support, while 12 percent of grants were for operating support.

Consistent with Mama Cash’s description of women’s funds, the women’s funds in this study demonstrated a sharp focus on women’s rights, both internationally and within their own countries, and sought to achieve structural change on a wide array of issues affecting women and girls. In particular, women’s funds were attentive to the needs of marginalized communities, such as the LBT community, a population group that received little attention or interest from funders at large. Although women’s funds supported initiatives in education and health—two of the more popular areas of work for foundations overall—much of their work was done through the lens of human rights. Based on this distinctive lens, women’s funds often direct their funding to marginalized populations and human rights causes.

ENDNOTES

1. Based on 281 grants awarded by eight European women’s funds designated as benefitting women and girls. It was not possible to code all 281 women and girls grants by subject area, due to insufficient grant descriptions. Thus, subject area percentages do not add up to 100.
In the preceding chapters, we used survey and grants data to describe the scope, distribution, and diversity of philanthropic giving in Europe for women and girls. In this chapter, we take a closer look at the work of five foundations and one collaborative initiative supporting women and girls, drawing upon data from interviews, web sites, and internal foundation documents. The “cases” in this chapter represent a pan-European spread of funders, including independent, family, and public fundraising foundations. They are:

- Bernard van Leer Foundation, the Netherlands
- King Baudouin Foundation, Belgium
- Learning Bridges Initiative: the Women’s Fund in Georgia, the Slovak-Czech Women’s Fund, and the Reconstruction Women’s Fund in Serbia
- Oak Foundation, Switzerland
- Sabanci Foundation, Turkey
- Sigrid Rausing Trust, United Kingdom

The foundations featured in this chapter have come to this work for a host of reasons and from a variety of perspectives, reflecting their diverse missions and historical priorities. Such a diversity of approaches is of course inevitable and healthy for the field. Rationales for focusing some or all of a foundation’s work on women and girls range from straightforward acknowledgement that women’s rights are inherently important to a passionate concern over the fact that gender inequality is a pervasive global problem, to the notion that investing in women and girls is an efficient and effective way to achieve greater impact. The bottom line is that each foundation finds its own point of entry into this work.

As noted in previous chapters, our research shows that 37 percent of the foundations explicitly designated women and girls in their work at the mission or programme level. In addition, two-thirds of foundations indicated they had designated some of their expenditures to women and girls and 90 percent of foundations indicated interest in supporting this area of work. As such, though the vast majority of foundations in Europe do not focus their work primarily on women and girls, the data suggest that many foundations see innate points of connection between their foundation’s work and the value of investing in women and girls.

In this chapter, we examine different points of entry into this work, the specific strategies employed by funders in supporting women and girls, and the philosophies driving those strategies. We do so by considering two broad types of funders:

1. Funders whose primary focus does not directly relate to women and girls, but whose work integrates a “gender lens” approach to understand more fully the issues they do focus on and to craft the most effective responses; and

2. Funders that focus their mission on women and girls and/or have a dedicated programme for women and girls

The foundations selected as “cases” for this chapter were chosen by design. (For profiles of each foundation, see Appendix C.) Each foundation, in its own way, has grappled with the complexities of how best to support women and girls in its work. Their stories are intended to be illustrative, showing how foundations have crafted strategies and approaches for supporting women and girls that resonate with their foundation’s unique set of priorities. And though there are important distinctions to be made between the approaches undertaken by foundations whose work explicitly focuses on women and girls and those whose work does not focus centrally on women and girls, there are also striking commonalities among the funders profiled here.

Each has, in some form or fashion, adopted a gender lens for its work. Many have struggled with issues of how best to build internal staff capacity to advance support for women and girls. Further, many have wrestled with the compounded issues related to assessment although the area of assessment is, of course, a core struggle for all foundations and is not unique to funding women and girls. By sharing examples of how this work is done we hope to stimulate debate and, where appropriate, help adapt practice.
5.1 FUNDERS WHOSE PRIMARY FOCUS DOES NOT DIRECTLY RELATE TO WOMEN AND GIRLS

The work of European foundations is wide-ranging and touches on an array of programmatic areas and population groups. Foundations surveyed for this study were most likely to cite children and youth and the economically disadvantaged as population groups they seek to support. In both of these areas, there are natural connections to work supporting women and girls. For example, when addressing issues affecting children and youth, foundations must inevitably consider the roles of parents, and especially mothers, when crafting programmes. Similarly, the fact that around the world women are disproportionately represented among the poor means that foundations working to address economic disparities must consider the specific situations of women in designing effective interventions.

Such natural connections are reflected in the stories of the two foundations profiled in this section—Bernard van Leer Foundation and King Baudouin Foundation. While these foundations do not focus primarily on women and girls, they have nonetheless integrated a gender lens into their work as a way to become more effective in realising their respective organisational and programmatic goals. In some cases, they also support projects specifically designed for women.

Bernard van Leer Foundation (BVL)

An independent, private organisation based in the Netherlands, BVL is firmly rooted in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and concentrates on improving opportunities for disadvantaged young children. The foundation’s programmes range from aiding transition to primary schools in Tanzania to funding Slovak Mothers Centres in Slovakia in order to enhance and improve understanding of children’s issues among the public, caregivers and policy makers.

The line between supporting early childhood education and serving women is a porous one. Lisa Jordan, Executive Director, explains:

“We operate as an investor in children—we are not branded as being engaged specifically on women and girls but rather the youngest children defined as 0–8. Of course, as we are concerned with the very youngest, our grantmaking tends to extend to helping women in their positions as caretakers with whom babies build strong bonds. When we are programming around girls it is genuinely to improve the welfare of the child.

Though the foundation’s work focuses on children, it employs a multiple lens approach, including a focus on gender, to enhance the efficiency of its work. In this way, gender, along with other important dimensions such as economic disadvantage, are considered in foundation decision-making. Jordan notes:

Using a gender lens helps us be more effective. How do you run a gender lens? We have meta-lenses. We ask: Who is disadvantaged? In Europe, for example, we see that the Roma are the most disadvantaged, with inadequate legal arrangements and cycles of poverty. So one approach we would take is to bring Roma girls into formal educational systems.

Complementing its use of multiple lenses to be as effective as possible, BVL is a research-driven organisation. For example, when studies demonstrated that 97 percent of domestic violence is perpetuated by men against women and that babies witnessing violence are impacted as if they were being hurt themselves, the foundation decided to support an initiative that seeks to reduce violence against children via a strategy of reducing violence against women. Jordan reflects, “Work on children leads us to their mothers. The strategy is developed through an analysis of the experience of the children.”

The collection and strategic use of data to document the effectiveness of using a gender lens is a forte of the foundation. Jordan explains:

“When you demonstrate through the use of appropriate data collection that grantmaking is more effective if you take the gender dimension into consideration, this is a compelling argument that foundations promoting poverty reduction, for example, will be convinced by.”

—Lisa Jordan, Bernard van Leer Foundation, Executive Director
Armed with critical baseline information, the BVL aims to engage others in collaborative efforts that can be clearly evaluated and which optimise the use of available resources across foundations.

**King Baudouin Foundation (KBF)**

A large independent public benefit foundation based in Belgium, with assets in excess of €100 million, KBF’s work focuses on a broad range of programmatic areas, including health, migration, and international development, to name a few. Like Bernard van Leer, KBF utilises a gender lens in its work. In its approach, KBF seeks to understand how women’s and men’s realities are addressed explicitly with a view to preventing, or at least reducing, disadvantages. Applied to grantmaking, it is intentional about taking the dimension of gender and the specificities it uncovers into account in programme design and priorities, budget allocations, monitoring and evaluation. This approach is now automatically part of project managers thinking about their work and incorporated into early strategic thinking. This has also brought internal legitimacy to support for programmes focusing on women and girls. In the eyes of KBF, such an approach “enables an optimisation of available resources, increased collaboration and exchanges of skills and knowledge, and better quality decision making by bringing in a wider variety of perspectives and detailed critical analysis.”

At the mission level, KBF focuses on supporting projects and citizens who are committed to creating a better society and making a lasting contribution towards greater justice, democracy and respect for diversity. The challenges of developing innovative and just strategies in a diverse national community led the organisation to institutionalise a gender lens approach to its giving overall. The story of how KBF came to work this way illustrates how organisational change may be brought about through the efforts of an individual champion in combination with a forward thinking executive and board. Pascale Taminaux, Programme Manager at KBF, explains,

> Here it was truly the work of an individual, who convinced the other members at the top of the hierarchy. And it worked. Then there was a trickle-down process within the organisation. It is an evolution, not a revolution.

What is notable about KBF is that once this decision was made at the highest level of the foundation, deliberate steps—over a period of several years—were taken to establish a professional process to assure its success. Taminaux notes:

> “We take a gender mainstreaming approach. The key to success is showing added value. You must demonstrate that there is an advantage in undertaking this work.”

—Pascale Taminaux,
King Baudouin Foundation, Project Manager

Programme managers got together and had brainstorming and training sessions. We looked at our projects from a practical and pragmatic point of view. We brought in an external consultant as a sounding board and at the end of the process we created a tool box and included a short questionnaire which helps to identify if there is a gender bias. We organised a meeting for all colleagues, illustrating the toolbox with concrete projects and demonstrated how these tools could be effective. The group worked for three years before we incorporated this concept and activity into our strategic plan.

Institutional engagement is important in making this a success. A senior staffer continues as an in-house resource, helping colleagues meet compliance requirements which now include a short questionnaire on how gender differences are being addressed as part of all mandatory submissions. Managers can also request coaching as appropriate by an external firm. Juries and external partners, including other foundations, are also encouraged to use a gender lens.

But evaluating the direct impact of this is a long-term process, even if sometimes positive results are immediately apparent. A recent in-depth analysis of KBF’s work in funding poverty from a gender lens has been undertaken and demonstrates, for example, that from 2006-2009 the projects specifically aimed at women in this sector increased from 10 percent to 20 percent, while the funding increased from 9 to 19 percent.

Taminaux shares another example of how using this approach helped the foundation identify inequity in its funding decisions.

> One example is funding of leadership. Over the years it became clear that more men were being supported than women. We turned to an external consulting firm and asked them to assess why this was the case, and to see if we could change the way we communicate so that there might be a shift in the balance of applicants.

KBF takes a comprehensive approach to this effort. This includes making comparative studies of the situations of men and women, identifying sources of inequity and endeavouring to reduce them as well as accounting for the requirements and realities of both genders without relying on stereotyped images. KBF also proactively shares its experiences on issues affecting women both within the foundation and within the broader giving community. Echoing comments by Lisa Jordan of Bernard van Leer, KBF feels that they need to make progress demonstrating that a gender lens brings better results. Taminaux shares:
The key to success in this area is showing added value. You must demonstrate that there is a plus in undertaking this work. You have to convince your colleagues and show them that taking different approaches is positive. It is also important to take a step by step approach. You should not overload people so that they feel overwhelmed. Ultimately, we need to brainstorm more on return on investment and figure out better forms of measurement. We are working on this now.

5.2 FUNDERS THAT FOCUS THEIR MISSION ON WOMEN AND GIRLS AND/OR HAVE A DEDICATED PROGRAMME FOR WOMEN AND GIRLS

In our survey of European foundations, 37 percent of foundations indicated that women and girls were a population group they seek to support. Some of these foundations explicitly name women and girls in their mission or grantmaking guidelines, signalling a strong commitment and focus to this area of work. Other foundations may run a dedicated programme devoted to women and girls. Some do both. In the overall landscape of European philanthropy, these foundations represent a small slice, yet they have made substantial investments and have taken leadership roles both in Europe and abroad in support of women and girls. Three foundations—Sabanci Foundation, Oak Foundation, and Sigrid Rausing Trust—are profiled here, as well as a funding collaborative of women's funds, called the Learning Bridges Initiative. While each of these entities has taken its own approach to its work on women and girls, each brings a strong rights-based orientation to their efforts.

Sabanci Foundation

Established in 1974 as one of the largest family foundations in Turkey with assets over €469 million, the Sabanci Foundation has as its primary mission “to promote social development and social awareness among current and future generations by supporting initiatives that create impact and lasting change in people’s lives.” The Foundation’s support for women and girls was initiated with an invitation to join the United Nations Joint Program to Promote and Protect the Human Rights of Women and Girls (UNJP) as a partner in a pilot project in collaboration with the Turkish Ministry of Interior. Recognizing the importance of gender equality and women’s rights in Turkey, the Sabanci Foundation accepted the invitation and allocated more than 1.5 million USD to a programme that has led to impacts at the local and national policy level. According to Filiz Bikmen Bugay, Manager of Programs:

“The UN’s invitation to join this programme acted as a catalyst for the foundation’s expanded support for women’s and girls’ rights. The UNJP was a public-private partnership that offered a great learning opportunity in supporting women’s and girls’ rights in Turkey and literally changed the way the foundation saw its role as a social change agent.

Today, the Sabanci Foundation has successfully rolled out the UNJP, which has focused on improving the national policy environment, building local government and NGO capacity, designing service models for women and girls and raising awareness about women’s and girls’ rights. Many factors came together to make this programme effective. Yet amongst the most important was the commitment of the Chair of the Foundation, Ms. Guler Sabanci, whose role as a businesswoman and leader made her an effective spokesperson to convey influential messages about gender equality and the rights of women in Turkish society. This experience opened new avenues for the Foundation, which then decided to develop a comprehensive programme strategy and grant programme that would, in addition to women and girls, allocate support to eliminate inequalities affecting youth and persons with disabilities. According to Filiz Bikmen Bugay:

‘With this approach, the Sabanci Foundation aims to mainstream issues of gender, youth and disability in the field, thus reaching those that face ‘double-discrimination’ and the greatest disadvantages in society. The Social Development Grant Program supports projects which not only mainstream gender, but allow women’s organisations to think about youth and disability in the spectrum of their work for the first time.

The UN partnership is an example of how collaboration and coalition-building between a foundation, an international institution, and national and local governments can maximize impact on a complex issue such as gender inequality, which in the Turkish context, are deep-rooted and highly resistant to change. Bikmen Bugay concludes:
Officially established in 1998, the Oak Foundation is a philanthropic organisation based in Switzerland that commits its resources to address issues of global social and environmental concern (including separate programmes on Climate Change, Homelessness, and Human Rights). Over the past year, the foundation has worked to instil a gender-lensed approach across all its programmes, while continuing to run a separate “Issues Affecting Women” Programme as one of its main focus areas. This programme applies a social justice perspective and is committed to improving women’s safety and well-being; strengthening their overall economic security and social and political position; and advancing their rights at home and in the community. Specific programming complements this approach with two major priorities: ending violence against women and building women’s movements. For instance, the Oak Foundation supported a women’s fund in Central America to re-grant to organised migrant and immigrant women’s groups to promote and defend the human rights of women migrants within Central America.

Florence Tercier Holst-Roness, Programme Officer, explains,

“The best thing is to have both a gender approach or gender lens and also have special programmes for women’s rights. Without a specific focus, expertise is incomplete.”

—Florence Tercier Holst-Roness
Oak Foundation, Programme Officer, Issues Affecting Women Grants

The Oak Foundation’s Issues Affecting Women Programme supports grassroots women’s organisations and women’s funds around the world, and it has developed a series of practices to work with these organisations more effectively. Many, though not all, of these organisations are small in size, with modest budgets. Working with these groups has taught the Oak Foundation that funding small organisations with limited professional resources requires making some adjustments in its traditional funding procedures. Due diligence procedures must be modified slightly and focus on unrestricted funding, which allows easier access for smaller grassroots grantees. The Oak Foundation is also tackling the challenges of conducting relevant and effective assessments of social change work done both by and for women. In 2009, it funded a workshop for women’s funds to stimulate new means of measuring impact within a feminist context. Other related follow-up activities in this area are ongoing.

The Oak Foundation takes a dual track approach. It supports specific programmes for women and girls while at the same time it mainstreams a gender lens across the foundation. The goal is to enable both deep and broad commitment to these issues.

The Sigrid Rausing Trust (SRT)

As one of the world’s leading private donors to women’s rights, this London-based foundation operates four grantmaking areas, each connected to human rights—civil and political rights, social justice, women’s rights, and minority rights. Founded in 1995, the foundation has been firmly committed to women’s rights from its inception, reflecting the concern of its founder and her fellow trustees on the Board. SRT operates in more than 20 countries to promote the safety, equality, justice, freedom and dignity of all women. It supports grantees working on a wide range of issues, from gender-based violence and female genital mutilation to organisations using legal remedies to defend women’s rights. There is some overlap between organisations that work on development and human rights issues, but SRT prioritises those working explicitly on women’s human rights. The rights-based approach is complemented by a historic commitment to providing long-term core support to organisations. Poonam Joshi, Interim Programme Director of the Women’s Rights Programme, explains:
Many human rights organisations have relatively easy access to earmarked project money but find it difficult to find the funds for running costs. We believe that unrestricted funding encourages innovation and imagination. We normally begin our partnership with grantees with a one year grant, followed by up to three cycles of three year grants. This has enabled organisations to initiate innovative projects that require longer term investment and has also enabled them to expand the range of services available to women.

Such funding gives grantees flexibility and stability to achieve their goals. Another particular strength of SRT is their sub-granting at the grassroots level or in regions where the Trust does not have the capacity to reach. It is an interesting model for smaller foundations which are less likely to have staff in all areas internationally.

Learning Bridges Initiative, a coalition of three women’s funds based in Central and Eastern Europe/the Commonwealth of Independent States (CEE/CIS) comprised of the Women’s Fund in Georgia, the Slovak-Czech Women’s Fund, and the Reconstruction Women’s Fund in Serbia.

Women’s funds represent a distinctive and strategic form of giving—though many are small in size compared to large international funders, they are vitally important in reaching the poorest and most marginalised girls and women in their respective countries and regions. They seek to maximise their impact by focusing exclusively on promoting the interests of women and girls across all fields with an emphasis on political empowerment. The Learning Bridges Initiative is a cross-regional project which functions as a peer-to-peer learning project aimed at strengthening the organisational capacity and collaboration among the three participating women’s funds. While this specific project does not include a grantmaking component, all of these women’s funds do grantmaking individually. Defending the human rights of marginalised communities and, in particular, supporting those facing multiple discriminations are priorities for all of these funds. As regional funds they face local challenges which impact on their choice of groups to fund. Peace building and Roma-related issues, for example, are key to their efforts.

As part of their broader mandate, these women’s funds seek to engage a broad range of constituents at multiple levels beyond grantmaking, which includes linking and networking within and across sectors. Marketa Hronková, Co-Director of the Slovak-Czech Women’s Fund, explains:

> Women’s rights have always been a cornerstone of the Trust. The Trust believes that the best way to support women’s human rights is through a specific programme.”

—Poonam Joshi, Sigrid Rausing Trust, Interim Women’s Rights Programme Director

We work with activists to create activities together. Our foundations were created by these movements and remain a part of them. Assessment, too, is different. Our initiative should increase sharing practices and experiences so that ultimately we increase the global impact of our work. Respect for each other and openness in the learning process together are key for us. This learning will pay off long term.

As part of the Learning Bridges Initiative, each of the women’s funds hosted the other funds for extended site visits. In total, there were six site visits over a period of 18 months. The goals of these exchanges were twofold, to share what each fund considers their most developed structures and practices, and to seek solutions to some of their most pressing practical challenges by learning from what others have done to address similar problems. Based on these experiences they are starting a pilot project to undertake common grantmaking for lesbian, bisexual, and transgender activists to make peer visits at different lesbian, bisexual, and transgender events within the four countries. One difficulty facing these organisations is that local philanthropy is developing very slowly in the region and many international funders have been withdrawing from the region. The women’s funds believe that other funds might also benefit from similar exchanges, and considers the initiative as an exploration into what future exchanges between like-minded funds could look like.

5.3 SYNTHESIS

Each of the foundations profiled in this chapter, whether their work focused primarily on women and girls or not, has found its own specific manner of working in this area. These five foundations and one funding collaborative are not intended to be representative of all European foundations, and there may well be other models and methods for doing this work that we did not evoke. For example, we did not include organisations like Oxfam and Hivos, which did not correspond to our definition of foundation for the purpose of this research but clearly are major players in this area. Most of the foundations we spoke to are grantmakers, though some also operate programmes. As these profiles illustrate, there is no single road map to best practice, as each foundation has different reasons for and approaches to supporting women and girls depending upon their missions, histories, and operating philosophies. While a number of foundations supporting women and girls utilise a social justice or a human rights approach, this is not necessarily a prerequisite for working in this area.
Foundations funded many different kinds of organisations, initiatives, and projects. Some foundations, like King Baudouin Foundation and the Oak Foundation, supported work internationally, while others, like Sabanci Foundation, focused on local and national level projects. Some foundations like the Bernard van Leer Foundation, sought to provide basic educational and social services to their target groups, while others like the Sigrid Rausing Trust were more engaged in funding advocacy efforts intended to create long term structural changes.

A number of different elements contribute to successful work in this area. For most of the foundations profiled here, engaging the resources of a strong Board and executive staff leadership was key. These leaders served as advocates both within the organisation and to external stakeholders. They were able to communicate persuasively the value of supporting women and girls and the need for such work to become foundation priorities, either as a designated programme area and/or as an integrated perspective across all of the foundation’s programmatic areas.

While strong leadership is vital, it is not the only critical factor. Each of the foundations profiled invested in offering ongoing professional development opportunities for their staff (and Board) to become better-versed in the policies and practices needed to support women and girls. In the case of the Sigrid Rausing Trust and the Oak Foundation, we see that this professional development can be as simple and eye-opening as conducting site visits with staff to grantees. In other cases, foundations hired external consultants to stimulate staff awareness and assist them in applying a gender lens to their work.

A number of the foundations profiled also mentioned the importance of being attentive to issues related to measurement and assessment, which corresponds to an increasing tendency among funders’ emphasis on assessing “value for money” and delivering on measurable and concrete results. While assessing successes and failures—and learning from them—are certainly important issues for funding women and girls, they are not unique to work in this area.

For foundations supporting women’s groups specifically—both grassroots organisations and those working at a larger scale—a set of promising practices emerge, as well. These include adapting foundation practices as necessary to enable funding of smaller organisations, applying relevant evaluation schemes that acknowledge the theoretical and strategic frameworks within which organisations working with women and girls operate, supporting dedicated staff members who can serve as in-house resources and experts in this work, building partnerships to leverage limited resources, and exploring long-term opportunities for providing unrestricted funding to women’s groups.

Challenges persist, too. For organisations already working in this field, many of these issues are internal: how can individuals seeking to work in this area successfully persuade their colleagues and Boards to engage? How can impact be reasonably measured? How do foundations operationalise a gender lens in their work? What can be done to help develop better partnerships, both between foundations and in the public-private sphere? Given limited resources, relationship-building and collaboration with key stakeholders are critical to making this work successful.

Also, we recognise that some foundations are wary of publicly committing to supporting women and girls for political reasons. These foundations are not operating in a vacuum. The broader social climate is critical in enabling change in this area. Yet, the cases here demonstrate that even when tradition or mission does not permit focusing on specifically funding women and girls, there are many ways of being effective in this field, with a plethora of creative opportunities for engagement. Without specifying a single road map to best practice, the foundations profiled in this chapter suggest paths forward for those aiming to create or expand programmes in the area of supporting women and girls.

“I don’t like the term paradigm shift usually, but in this case it is appropriate. We are really looking to support core activities of our grantees, trust them to know what is best for them and to properly identify their needs, and to therefore change the balance of power between donor and grantees.”

—Marketa Hronkova, Country Director Czech Republic, Slovak-Czech Women’s Fund
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Conclusion

This study represents a starting point for discussion rather than an end point. It offers provisional answers to questions such as how many foundations focus their work on women and girls, how much funding goes to programmes supporting women and girls, and what approaches foundations take in this work. As the portrait of European foundation funding for women and girls emerges, we recognize that decisions about foundation giving are complex and must be viewed in the context of a whole host of variables, including local culture, government policies, foundation size, and programmatic priorities.

But within this complicated landscape, there are many ways foundations can work to advance the rights and well-being of women and girls, whether that is their mission or not. While 19 percent of surveyed foundations indicated a mission-level commitment to women and girls, we found just as many foundations with other priorities (18 percent) that have effectively furthers their missions by taking an intentional approach to funding women and girls in the context of pursuing their primary goals. In other words, supporting women and girls need not be the province of only those foundations with a special interest in women’s rights. Supporting women and girls, if done intentionally, is in fact emerging as a promising practice for improving programme effectiveness in general.

This raises encouraging possibilities in light of the fact that 62 percent of surveyed foundations said they allocated at least some of their expenditures in support of women and girls and virtually all foundations (90 percent) expressed interest in at least one issue related to women and girls. Taken together, these findings suggest that there are untapped opportunities for foundations to expand and deepen their support for women and girls.

*Opportunities to expand foundation support for women and girls exist.* Our research revealed that the median percentage of foundation giving to women and girls was 4.8 percent. Our research also showed a wide gap in the number of foundations funding women and girls (62 percent) and the number of foundations interested in at least one issue area related to women and girls (90 percent). Although this research did not explore the reasons for this gap, one possible reason might be that foundations, despite their interest, have not found a tangible point of entry into this work. Efforts to tap into these interests might involve convening foundations based on issue areas garnering high levels of interest, such as violence against women, access to education, and poverty. Likewise, issue areas generating lower levels of interest, such as lesbian, bisexual, and transgender rights, might warrant awareness and outreach efforts to foster foundation interest and engagement.

*Opportunities to deepen foundation support for women and girls exist.* While 62 percent of foundations said they allocated at least some of their expenditures in support of women and girls, only 37 percent indicated that they were doing this in an intentional way. Efforts to further articulate and communicate the value of consciously applying a gender lens to grantmaking and other programmatic activities could increase the percentage of foundations taking an intentional approach to funding women and girls, while improving programme effectiveness at the same time.

As for those foundations already intentionally engaged in this work, survey findings indicate that they have high levels of interest in a wide range of issues affecting women and girls, and are likely to be receptive to pursuing new areas of work. There are also opportunities for these foundations to become more deeply engaged by creating novel and effective ways to leverage their existing work, whether through building the capacity of grassroots women’s organisations or raising the profile of their work through strategic partnerships. They can also serve as resources for foundations that are just beginning to explore the possibilities of funding women and girls in a more strategic way.

While this research shows there is genuine potential and motivation among foundations to fund women and girls, a key challenge is moving from interest to action. Here are some possible next steps:

1. Develop a “How To” primer for European foundations to implement programming for women and girls.
2. Develop a peer training programme for grantmakers on how to integrate a gender lens to their work.
3. Create an interest group on gender within the European Foundation Centre to develop messages and strategies aimed at encouraging gender-sensitive grantmaking.
4. Develop a charter within the European Foundation Centre and beyond to encourage foundations to sign on to a minimum level of awareness and commitment to funding with gender in mind, be it a stand-alone charter or under the broader umbrella of “diversity.”
We also recognise the need to demonstrate the outcomes and impact of the transformative work led by women and girls in their communities. As this is a broader challenge within the philanthropic community, especially for those applying a social justice approach, this is an opportunity to come together with other actors in the field to explore ways to understand and document the value of investing in and sustaining community-based organisations over time.

Finally, while this study has identified untapped potential among foundations that could lead to expanded and deeper funding of women and girls, it is catalysing the untapped potential of women and girls themselves that represents the most important goal of this work.
# Appendix A

## Interest in Issues Affecting Women and Girls

### TABLE A1. Intentional Engagement Foundations: Interest in Issues Affecting Women and Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Very Interested</th>
<th>Somewhat Interested</th>
<th>Not Interested</th>
<th>Net (V-N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violence Against Women</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty among Women and/or Girls</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Issues Affecting Women and/or Girls</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Women and/or Girls (in general)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s and/or Girls’ Access to Education</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Immigrant and/or Refugee Women</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging Issues Affecting Women</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s and/or Girls’ Leadership Development</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s and/or Girls’ Labour Rights</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Entrepreneurs</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafficking of Women and/or Girls</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Empowerment of Women</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of War and Armed Conflict on Women and/or Girls</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Philanthropy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Women and/or Girls in Religious or Fundamentalist Contexts</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian, Bisexual, and/or Transgender Rights</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s and/or Girls’ Access to Media/Freedom of Expression</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women and/or Girls in Sports</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in the Sciences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Shaded items indicate endorsement from at least half of foundations, based on a sum of “very interested” and “somewhat interested.”

### TABLE A2. Incidental Engagement Foundations: Interest in Issues Affecting Women and Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Very Interested</th>
<th>Somewhat Interested</th>
<th>Not Interested</th>
<th>Net (V-N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violence Against Women</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty among Women and/or Girls</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Immigrant and/or Refugee Women</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s and/or Girls’ Access to Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Women and/or Girls (in general)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Issues Affecting Women and/or Girls</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafficking of Women and/or Girls</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging Issues Affecting Women</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Entrepreneurs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s and/or Girls’ Leadership Development</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Women and/or Girls in Religious or Fundamentalist Contexts</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s and/or Girls’ Labour Rights</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Empowerment of Women</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in the Sciences</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Philanthropy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s and/or Girls’ Access to Media/ Freedom of Expression</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of War and Armed Conflict on Women and/or Girls</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women and/or Girls in Sports</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian, Bisexual, and/or Transgender Rights</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Shaded items indicate endorsement from at least half of foundations, based on a sum of “very interested” and “somewhat interested.”

### TABLE A3. No Engagement Foundations: Interest in Issues Affecting Women and Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Very Interested</th>
<th>Somewhat Interested</th>
<th>Not Interested</th>
<th>Net (V-N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women’s and/or Girls’ Access to Education</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women in the Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging Issues Affecting Women</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Issues Affecting Women and/or Girls</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s and/or Girls’ Leadership Development</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty among Women and/or Girls</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Against Women</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Entrepreneurs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Philanthropy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Immigrant and/or Refugee Women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Empowerment of Women</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Women and/or Girls (in general)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Women and/or Girls in Religious or Fundamentalist Contexts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women and/or Girls in Sports</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of War and Armed Conflict on Women and/or Girls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafficking of Women and/or Girls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s and/or Girls’ Access to Media/ Freedom of Expression</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s and/or Girls’ Labour Rights</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian, Bisexual, and/or Transgender Rights</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Shaded items indicate endorsement from at least half of foundations, based on a sum of “very interested” and “somewhat interested.”
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FIGURE B1. Grants to Women and Girls by Subject Area by Foundation

Source: The Foundation Center, Untapped Potential: European Foundation Funding For Women & Girls, 2011. Based on grants from 42 European foundations designated as benefiting women and girls.

NOTE: It was not possible to code all 392 women and girls grants by subject area, due to incomplete grant descriptions. All 42 foundations are noted individually by region (W = West, S = South, E = East, N = North).
# Appendix C

## Foundation Profiles

### Bernard van Leer Foundation, The Hague, Netherlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description/Mission</th>
<th>The Bernard van Leer Foundation is an international grantmaking foundation based in The Hague. Its mission is to improve opportunities for children up to age 8 who are growing up in socially and economically difficult circumstances. Through its free publications it shares what it learns with practitioners and policy-makers and shapes the debate about early childhood care and education.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Type</td>
<td>Independent/Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Profile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets (2009)</td>
<td>€23 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantmaking Profile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Work</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Areas</td>
<td>Education; young children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Groups Specified</td>
<td>Children/Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG Named in Mission or Grantmaking Guidelines?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Grant Benefiting Women and Girls</td>
<td>€98,800 for programmes to improve access and quality of early and education for 10,000 children of 0–8 years old in Morogoro Municipal, Morogoro Rural and Mvomero Districts by 2014. (Morogoro, Tanzania)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*May not represent all charitable giving.

### King Baudouin Foundation, Belgium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description/Mission</th>
<th>The King Baudouin Foundation is an independent public benefit foundation based in Belgium. The foundation focuses on supporting projects and citizens who are committed to creating a better society and making a lasting contribution towards greater justice, democracy and respect for diversity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Type</td>
<td>Independent/Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Profile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets (2009)</td>
<td>€82 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantmaking Profile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Work</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Areas</td>
<td>Arts and Culture; Civil Society, Law &amp; Rights; Environment; Health; Immigration/Integration; International Affairs/Development; Philanthropy; Social Justice; Other grant/programme activity area, specified: Democracy, leadership, local engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Groups Specified</td>
<td>Aging/Elderly/Senior Citizens; Children/Youth; Economically Disadvantaged; Ethnic/Racial Minorities; Immigrant/Refugee Communities; People with HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG Named in Mission or Grantmaking Guidelines?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Grant Benefiting Women and Girls</td>
<td>€10,000 for Femmes Immigres et Culture in support of women volunteers to give time and knowledge to others and provide support and care at home for foreign-born elderly people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*May not represent all charitable giving.
### Learning Bridges (The Slovak-Czech Women’s Fund—Slovak Republic and Czech Republic*, The Women’s Fund—Georgia*, The Reconstruction Women’s Fund—Serbia*)

**Description/Mission**
Learning Bridges is a cross-regional project which was developed in partnership with three women’s funds active in four countries—the Reconstruction Women’s Fund (Serbia), the Slovak-Czech Women’s Fund, and the Women’s Fund in Georgia. The aim of the project is to develop a model of mutual learning for feminist philanthropic actors rooted in respect, trust, transparency, and feminist approaches through site visits and extended exchange of experience and knowledge for self-improvement, lifelong learning and empowering the work of women’s movements in the countries in which they operate.

**Foundation Type**
Public/Fundraising*, Independent/Private*

**Financial Profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Assets (2009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All funds have assets under €500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grantmaking Profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope of Work</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Areas</td>
<td>Civil Society; Law &amp; Rights; Education; Human Rights; Philanthropy; Social Justice*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment; Human Services; Immigration/Migration/Integration*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts and Culture; Community Development; Peace*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health; International Affairs/Development*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Groups Specified</th>
<th>Women and/or Girls*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internally Displaced Women; Economically Disadvantaged*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnic/Racial Minorities; LBT People; People with Disabilities*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WG Named in Mission or Grantmaking Guidelines?** Yes

**Sample Grants Benefiting Women and Girls**
The Slovak-Czech Women’s Fund gave €4,000 to Fenestra for the “Back To Basics” project, which focused on the sustainability and development of autonomous services and advocacy activities of Fenestra, an organisation that deals with the issue of violence against women. (Slovakia)
The Women’s Fund in Georgia gave €1,600 to Young Teachers and Psychologists Association for a project aimed at making internally displaced women from Akhalgori to the village Frezeti, Mtskheta district more active, aware of rights and overcome gender stereotypes through conducting trainings and meetings. (Georgia)
The Reconstruction Women’s Fund gave 250,000 Serbian Dinar to the Women’s Center Uzice for adapting a new space where the organisation can carry out its activities.

*May not represent all charitable giving.

---

### Oak Foundation, Geneva, Switzerland

**Description/Mission**
The Oak Foundation is a private grantmaking organisation headquartered in Geneva, Switzerland. The Oak Foundation commits its resources to address issues of global, social, and environmental concern, particularly those that have a major impact on the lives of the disadvantaged.

**Foundation Type**
Independent/Private

**Financial Profile**
Not Available

**Grantmaking Profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope of Work</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Areas</td>
<td>Anti-slavery/human trafficking; Crime/violence prevention, abuse prevention; Crime/violence prevention, child abuse; Developmentally disabled, centres &amp; services; Environment; Environment, global warming; Environment, water resources; Homeless, human services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Population Groups Specified | Homeless People; Women and/or Girls; Students with Learning Differences; Children; Human Rights Defenders; Other Marginalized Populations |

**WG Named in Mission or Grantmaking Guidelines?** Yes

**Sample Grant Benefiting Women and Girls**
USD 207,894 for providing services to victims of domestic violence and lobbying for the adoption of amendments to the Bulgarian Law on Protection against Domestic Violence.

*May not represent all charitable giving.
### Sabanci Foundation, Turkey

**Description/Mission**  
The Sabanci Foundation is based in Turkey. The foundation’s mission is to promote social development and social awareness among current and future generations by supporting initiatives that create impact and lasting change in people’s lives.

**Foundation Type**  
Independent/Private

**Financial Profile**

- **Total Assets (2010)**: €470 million

**Grantmaking Profile**

- **Scope of Work**: National
- **Subject Areas**: Civil Society, Community Development, Human Rights, Social Justice, Social Participation, Economic Development
- **Population Groups Specified**: Children/Youth, Economically Disadvantaged, People with Disabilities, Women and/or Girls
- **WG Named in Mission or Grantmaking Guidelines?**: Yes
- **Sample Grant Benefiting Women and Girls**: €556,000 for the Mother Child Education Foundation, which seeks to reach a total of 11,000 women, young girls and women with orthopedic disabilities, to raise awareness of rights, and to increase literacy skills with the help of 300 volunteers. A unique aspect of the project is its aim to integrate the subject of disabilities in the course content (a new module regarding disability rights was included in the course materials).

*May not represent all charitable giving.*

### Sigrid Rausing Trust, London, United Kingdom

**Description/Mission**  
The Sigrid Rausing Trust is a private grantmaking foundation based in London, England. The purpose of the foundation is to support groups that work in the field of human rights, women’s rights, with programmes focused on civil and political rights, minority rights, and social justice.

**Foundation Type**  
Independent/Private

**Financial Profile**

- **Total Assets**: Not Available

**Grantmaking Profile**

- **Scope of Work**: International
- **Subject Areas**: Civil and political rights, women’s rights, minority rights, social justice.
- **Population Groups Specified**: Ethnic/Racial Minorities; Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender (LGBT) People; Immigrant/Refugee Communities; People with Disabilities; Women and/or Girls; Other Population Group, specified: Refugees and Migrants
- **WG Named in Mission or Grantmaking Guidelines?**: Yes
- **Sample Grant Benefiting Women and Girls**: 450,000 BP to Asylum Aid for the Refugee Women’s Resource Project and the appeal tribunal representation.

*May not represent all charitable giving.*